

MYSORE BOARD OF REVENUE BILL, 1954.

Motion to consider (contd.).

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಸಿ. ಬಸಪ್ಪ (ತರಿಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರ್ಪಡೆ ಆಗಿದ್ದು ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಅಪೀಲಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ, Sales Tax Amendment Bill ಎಂದು ಬೇರೆ ತಂದು Sales Tax Tribunalಗೆ ಅಪೀಲ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇವೆರಡೂ ಏಕೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ (ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಮತ್ತು ಮರಾ ಮತ್ತು ಶಾಖೆಗಳ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯೂನಲ್ ಮುಂದೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಅಪೀಲ್ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಅದಷ್ಟಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಅಪೀಲ್ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಎರಡೂ alternative remedies ಆಗಿವೆ.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I want to know one thing. How far the Government have made provision about the revision; whether the awards or the judgment given by the Tribunal or the Board are final; or whether the Government has still retained the power of revision?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Under Clause 6 of the Bill, provision has been made for preferring revision petitions to Government against the decision of the Board in regard to all matters excepting those mentioned in the schedule. In the schedule there is a list of matters in which the decision of the Board will be final and no revision petition can be preferred against the decision of the Board.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Regarding the personnel of the Revenue Board, it is stated that the appointment of the judicial officer or any other officer is optional; it is left to the Government to appoint a judicial officer. Our contention was that the member of the Committee must always be a judicial officer—either a District Judge or a retired High Court Judge. I think that change must be made here in the interest of the Board. Because, as it is, the Revenue Commissioner, the Excise Commissioner and the Commissioner for Local Self-Government, these three officers are the standing members; and District Judge or a person qualified to be a judge of the High Court or any

other officer whose appointment is left to the discretion of the Government. They may find a place or they may not find a place here. So I would like to point out that it is healthy and it will be for the benefit of the Board always to have a District Judge, and preferably I would suggest that a senior judge or even a retired High Court Judge, so that he may be the Chairman of the Board. That is one point to be considered.

Matter of Privilege.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—I want to bring to the notice of the Chair a matter affecting the privilege of this House. This House is aware that the Budget was presented at 1 P.M. and copies of the speech and the Budget proposals have been distributed to the Members when they re-assembled at half past three of the clock, and I find that the newspaper entitled "Daily Post" has had the opportunity to print and publish the entire contents of the Budget speech as well as the proposals much earlier than the Hon'ble Members of this House have had the opportunity to get at the copies of the Budget speech and the Memorandum. This, I should like to say, is a serious breach of the privilege of this House collectively and the privilege of every Hon'ble Member of this House. And as it is a matter of considerable importance and in my view, a serious breach of the privilege of this House, I request the Chair to take notice of this matter and to deal with it as the Chair thinks proper.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—Are you moving the Privilege Motion?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I am actually inviting the attention of the Chair to this fact and I shall hand in a written notice of motion if the Chair so directs.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Will you please give your Privilege Motion in writing so that we can examine?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I shall put it in writing. I have got the copy of the newspaper now. It is being sold near the premises of the Assembly.